

2. Басанець З. О. Новий німецько-український українсько-німецький словник. К. : АСК, 2006. 1023 с.
3. Желуденко М.А., Сабитова А.П. Переводимость / непереводаемость как психолингвистическая проблема. *Південний архів*. 2019. Вип. 79. С. 66-70.
4. Кочерган М.П. Основи зіставного мовознавства. К.: Академія, 2006. 424 с.
5. Мишкуров Е.Н. О «герменевтическом повороте» в современной теории и методологии перевода. Режим доступа: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/o-germenevticheskom-povorote-v-sovremennoy-teorii-i-metodologii-perevoda-chast-I>
6. Огуй О. Д. Лексикологія німецької мови. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003. 402 с.
7. DUDEN Online-Wörterbuch. Режим доступа: <https://www.duden.de/>

András Petrusinec,
Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education
Supervisor:
Dr. Ilona Lechner, PhD.,
Docent of Philology Department,
Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education

TRANSLATION AND RELEVANCE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE TARGET AUDIENCE

In the history of humankind, written and oral translations have played a key role in communication between people, especially in terms of commerce, education, and religion. In the middle 20th century, people had an even greater demand for precise and appropriate translations. This led to the emergence of translation studies as an independent discipline. The current paper is aimed at presenting the translation and Relevance from the perspective of the target audience.

According to David Crystal [1, p. 344], “the term 'translation' is the neutral term used for all tasks where the meaning of expressions in one language (the 'source' language) is turned into the meaning of another (the

'target' language), whether the medium is spoken, written, or signed". Translation can be examined from two perspectives, one is translation as a product, and the other is translation as a process. In the present review, we refer to translation as a process. This perspective is not just trying to define the translation at a linguistic level, but also takes into account non-linguistic elements and is trying to identify their functions [2]. In addition, in this perspective, translation is seen as a purposeful, planned activity, a transcultural interaction that aims to create a target text that meets the requirement of the predetermined objectives as well as the target audience in particular circumstances. The actual form of the target text, therefore, depends on the intended purpose and not solely on the structure of the source text [4]. Moreover, this perspective puts an emphasize on the importance of the Relevance Theory.

The fathers of the Relevance Theory are Sperber & Wilson [5], but Gutt was the first who applied this theory to translation in his 1989 dissertation. Gutt defines translation as inter-lingual interpretive communication in a secondary communication situation in which the translator communicates with the secondary reader. An important feature of translation is that it tries to be relevant by resembling the original text [3, p. 32]. According to Relevance Theory, in communication, both the speaker/writer and the listener/reader assume that the other's statement is relevant. A statement is only relevant if it achieves an appropriate contextual effect with a reasonable processing effort. This process takes place in a so-called cognitive environment, which contains an individual's overall knowledge of the world. Thus, the information will only be relevant to the listener/reader if it is worth investing the energy on the part of the reader/listener in processing the information, i.e., it does not require too much effort on his/her part [5, p. 158]. Consequently, communication works in a cost-benefit way. The greater the contextual effect and the smaller the processing effort, the more relevant the statement is [3]. But in the case of translation, the effectiveness of the communication largely

depends on the translator whether it helps to the reader/listener to understand the text more easily or not.

In general, in a discourse, be it a dialogic or monologic utterance, there is always a sender, i.e., one who expresses himself, and there is always a receiver who receives the utterance [6, p. 483]. The translator helps the audience understand the statement that was essentially written in another language. Here, however, it is also important to note the aspect that Zachar [7, p. 270] points out ‘the author of the source language text does not address the fact that he (also) creates a message for a secondary audience – he leaves this to the translator’. That means that whether or not the target audience understands the translated text depends on nothing but the person of the translator, more precisely on his effort. However, this also requires the translator to take into account the target audience, which is by no means a homogeneous group. Nevertheless, the target audience belonging to the same social group has approximately similar beliefs about the world, the given topic and the culture of the given language. Consequently, if the translator takes into account the target audience in general, they will interpret the message in an approximately similar way [7]. Tátrai [6, p. 486] believes that the translator must take into account three important aspects: the physical world, the social world, and the mental world of the participants.

The physical world is formed by the space-time relationship system that is perceived by both the sender and the receiver. Space determines where action takes place, while time helps readers decide when action takes place. In spatial relations, it is important to pay attention to the figure-ground alignment, which is that in general the position of the smaller, less visible thing (the figure) is compared to the position of the larger, more visible, still thing (the ground). In the case of time relations, it is worth paying attention to the fact that there may be differences between the time when the expression was first formulated and the time when the expression was received, which also affect the interpretation of spatial conditions. This includes participants’ social relationships as well as

references to each other and other third parties. Here, it is worthwhile for the translator to look at the selection of appropriate language items based on whether the senders and the receivers have a subordinate, superior, or even equal relationship, formal or informal, personal or impersonal relationship with whom or to whom they refer to. To do this, you must first know the culture of the target language so that the translator can correctly decide what is appropriate and what is not in a given situation (e.g. formal vs informal addresses). The third important factor that a translator needs to consider in relation to the target audience is the mental world. The mental world indicates the mental state of the participants, which includes factors such as personality, emotions, beliefs, desires, motivations, intentions. These factors greatly influence how readers, i.e. the target audience, will interpret the text [6, pp. 486-489].

Literature

1. Crystal, David. The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language. 1st Edit., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 472 p.
2. Cs. Jónás, Erzsébet. Fordításstiszta a nyelvudományban. *Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Közlemények, Miskolc*, IX. évfolyam, 2. szám, 2014. p. 54–62.
3. Heltai, Pál. Fordítás, relevancia, feldolgozás. In: Nádor Orsolya szerk. *A magyar mint európai és világnyelv. A XVIII. Magyar Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Kongresszus előadásai. Budapest, 2008. április 3–5. 5/1. kötet.* MANYE–Balassi Intézet, 2009. p. 27–53.
4. Lechner, Ilona. A relevanciaelmélet érvényesülése fordítás során Európai Unió szövegeket vizsgálva. In: Márku, A.; Tóth, E. (szerk.) *Többnyelvűség, regionalitás, nyelvtanítás: Tanulmányok a Hodinka Antal Nyelvészeti Kutatóközpont Kutatásaiból III.* Ungvár, Ukrajna: RIK-U Kiadó, 2017. p. 73-84.
5. Sperber, Dan Wilson, Deirdre. *Relevance.* Oxford:Blackwell, 1986. 279 p.
6. Tátrai, Szilárd. A kontextus fogalmáról. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 128(4), 2004. p. 479–494.
7. Zachar, Viktor. A fordító minimális erőfeszítése – Vélt vagy valós probléma? In: Bárdosi Vilmos (szerk.) *A szótól a szövegig.* Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó, 2012. p. 269–276.